

BOARD OF DESIGN REVIEW MINUTES

February 8, 2001

CALL TO ORDER: Chairman Walter Lemon III called the meeting to order at 6:34 p.m. in the Beaverton City Hall Council Chambers at 4755 SW Griffith Drive

ROLL CALL: Present were Chairman Walter Lemon III; Board Members Monty Edberg, Ronald Nardoza, Ashetra Prentice and Stewart Straus. Board Members Hal Beighley and Anissa Crane were excused.

Senior Planner John Osterberg, City Utilities Engineer David Winship, Engineering Technician II Charlie Harrison, Associate Planner Tyler Ryerson and Recording Secretary Sandra Pearson represented staff.

VISITORS:

Chairman Lemon read the format for the meeting and asked if any member of the audience wished to address the Board on any non-agenda item. There was no response.

NEW BUSINESS:

PUBLIC HEARINGS:

Chairman Lemon opened the Public Hearing and read the format of the meeting. There were no disqualifications of Board Members. No one in the audience challenged the right of any Board Member to hear any agenda items or participate in the hearing or requested that the hearing be postponed to a later date. He asked if there were any ex parte contact, conflict of interest or disqualifications in any of the hearings on the agenda. There was no response.

A. BDR 2000-0173 -- SORRENTO WATER WORKS EXPANSION TYPE 3 DESIGN REVIEW

This land use application has been submitted for a request for Design Review approval for the proposed expansion of an existing water works facility at 7850 SW 136th Avenue, for the construction of an approximately 600 square foot drinking water well pump house, including associated landscaping, paving and utilities. The development proposal is located on Assessor's Map 1S1-21CD, Tax

Lot 200, is zoned Urban Standard Density (R-5) and is approximately 1.66 acres in size.

Associate Planner Tyler Ryerson presented the Staff Report, submitted the materials board for review and discussed the specific characteristics and design of the proposed project. He presented a brief video of the site, describing the area where the proposed pump house would be located and summarized the proposal, which fits in with the residential characteristics of the existing neighborhood. Observing that the Planning Commission had approved CUP 2000-0027 -- Sorrento Water Works Conditional Use Permit on January 31, 2001, he recommended approval, adding that he is available to respond to questions or comments. On question, he advised Mr. Nardoza that a standard requirement provides that all utilities be undergrounded, adding that this is largely dependent upon the feasibility. At the request of Ms. Prentice, who requested clarification of the boundaries of the site, he indicated the landscaping plan and a proposed property line adjustment. Noting that the property to the east currently has one single-family home, he added that there has been some discussion regarding a possible subdivision in the future.

APPLICANT:

LAURA JACKSON, of *W & H Pacific, Inc.*, representing the City of Beaverton, pointed out that the application does meet applicable criteria described in the proposal and the necessity that this equipment be located in an enclosed structure, emphasizing that this is required by State law. Following distribution of copies of a revised landscape plan, which she discussed, she observed that there had been some concern with earthwork necessary for the original landscaping. Concluding, she offered to respond to any questions or comments.

On question, **DAVID WINSHIP**, City Utilities Engineer for the City of Beaverton, advised Chairman Lemon that typically no employees would be at the site on Saturdays or Sundays, except under special circumstances.

On question, Ms. Jackson informed Ms. Prentice that the west side of the site has two residences, adding that the residents preferred more of an open appearance and have not chosen to install any hedges.

KAN HWEE, representing *CH2M Hill* as the City of Beaverton's consultant and design engineer, indicated that he is available to respond to any questions or comments.

CHARLIE HARRISON, Engineering Technician for the City of Beaverton clarified the screening along east property line and the City's desire to purchase the additional fifteen feet offered to respond to any questions or comments.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY:

On question, no one from the public appeared to testify on this issue.

The public portion of the Public Hearing was closed.

Mr. Straus **MOVED** and Mr. Nardoza **SECONDED** a motion to approve BDR 2000-0173 -- Sorrento Water Works Expansion Type 3 Design Review, based upon the testimony, reports and exhibits presented during the public hearing on the matter and upon the background facts, findings and conclusions found in the Staff Report dated February 1, 2001, including Conditions of Approval Nos. 1 – 17, including an additional Condition of Approval, as follows:

18. The landscape plan presented during the Public Hearing is hereby approved and entered into the record as an exhibit.

Motion **CARRIED**, unanimously.

7:00 p.m. to 7:03 p.m. – break.

B. BDR 2000-0161 -- DANIA FURNITURE DEVELOPMENT AT NW CORNELL ROAD TYPE 3 DESIGN REVIEW

This land use application has been submitted for a request for Design Review approval for the development of two new retail buildings and one retail and warehouse building at 17005 NW Cornell Road. The proposed buildings total approximately 113,614 square feet in size, and include associated parking, landscaping and sidewalks. The development proposal is located on Assessor's Map 1N1-30DC, Tax Lot 200, is zoned General Commercial (GC) and is approximately 5.10 acres in size.

Senior Planner John Osterberg summarized the Staff Report, presented the materials board and described the design and characteristics of the proposed development. He discussed a letter received from Pat Russell providing suggestions and recommendations for this project. Observing that the application meets applicable criteria, he recommended approval, and offered to respond to any questions or comments. On question, he advised Mr. Straus of Dania's goal to allow flexibility in the location of the access. On question, he informed Chairman Lemon that none of the development has been constructed at this time. On question, he described for Ms. Prentice the long-standing plan for access connection, adding that there has been considerable discussion with Cornell Home Center. On question, he informed Ms. Prentice that the traffic flow behind Dania has been reviewed and that it has been determined that it meets all standards, adding that there appears to be nothing unsafe or inefficient regarding the circulation.

APPLICANT:

CYNTHIA NELSON, representing *LRS Architects, Inc.*, described the site as it currently exists, including the two accesses off of Cornell Road, explaining why one of these accesses would have to be closed.

LEE LEIGHTON, representing *Westlake Consultants, Inc.*, described the key issues regarding the site, including the visibility from Highway 26. Observing that the site provides good pedestrian connectivity, he mentioned that the applicant had worked hard on access issues to 173rd Avenue, where there is a signalized intersection.

Ms. Nelson pointed out that the owner has indicated some issues with conditions regarding access and how they could be resolved.

Chairman Lemon advised Ms. Nelson that the Board of Design Review has no authority to make any changes to Facilities Review, although it is possible to request further explanation.

Referring to the letter from Pat Russell, Mr. Leighton indicated that he might choose to respond to Mr. Russell's testimony tonight.

On question, Ms. Nelson advised Mr. Nardozza that Buildings A and B are one-story buildings.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY:

BRUCE FORCUM, representing *Cornell Home Center*, described efforts to work with Dania to resolve interconnection issues between the two parcels and offered to respond to any questions or comments.

PAT RUSSELL, expressed his appreciation to Mr. Leighton for attending two NAC meetings. Observing that he has been a planner for thirty years throughout four separate jurisdictions, he emphasized his extensive experience with development applications, adding that he has issues with reciprocal access. Noting that Washington County has jurisdiction, he pointed out that they have not yet signed off on the access on this project and that it may be necessary to wait five or six years for this connection, which would, in his opinion, create a serious traffic problem. He emphasized the necessity of appropriate and safe pedestrian access, expressing his opinion that the application should be continued until this has been adequately addressed. He discussed the necessity for access on 173rd Avenue, adding that he is certain that the applicant's intentions are good. Expressing his opinion that the building is out of scale, he stressed that it is the responsibility of the Board of Design Review to advocate quality design. He discussed the reflection of the light source, which creates visibility problems, and issues concerning native landscaping and the potential loss of native habitat in the large canopy trees near the Bronson Creek Corridor.

REBUTTAL:

On question, Chairman Lemon advised Mr. Leighton that new testimony involves lighting standards and criteria and landscaping.

On question, Ms. Nelson advised Mr. Straus that the applicant's landscape architect is not available this evening and that all buildings and parking would be constructed in one phase.

Mr. Osterberg discussed the status of the review by Washington County regarding access, and submitted into the record the approval from Washington County, dated January 11, 2001. Expressing his opinion that other elements have been adequately described and addressed, he offered to respond to final questions and comments.

Mr. Straus discussed the need for additional landscaping along the north elevation of the Dania building in order to provide for necessary improvements to the visual character of the building as viewed from Highway 26.

The public portion of the Public Hearing was closed.

Mr. Straus **MOVED** and Mr. Nardoza **SECONDED** a motion to approve BDR 2000-0161 -- Dania Furniture Development at NW Cornell Road Type 3 Design Review, based upon the testimony, reports and exhibits presented during the public hearing on the matter and upon the background facts, findings and conclusions found in the Staff Report dated February 1, 2001, including Conditions of Approval Nos. 1 – 19, plus

20. The applicant shall add seven Hogan Cedars to the landscaping along the north wall of the building at appropriate intervals that will not obstruct the windows and shall adjust the location of other plant materials as necessary.

Motion **CARRIED**, unanimously.

8:38 p.m. to 8:46 p.m. – break.

C. BDR 2000-0165 -- SW MILLIKAN WAY EXTENSION TYPE 3 DESIGN REVIEW

This land use application has been submitted for a request for Design Review approval to extend SW Millikan Way from its current terminus at SW Hocken Avenue to a connection with SW Cedar Hills Boulevard at SW Henry Street. In addition, the applicant is proposing associated improvements on SW Hocken Avenue, Electric Street, Lloyd Avenue and Henry Street, including intersection improvements, bicycle lanes, sidewalks, utilities, lighting and landscaping. The development proposal affects 16 individual tax lots. The development proposal is located on Washington County Assessor's Map 1S1-09DC, Tax Lots 300, 900,

1000 and 1100; Map 1S1-16AB, Tax Lots 400, 500, 501, 600, 601, 700, 800, 900, 1900 and 2500; Map 1S1-16BA, Tax Lot 2700; and Map 1S1-09CD, Tax Lot 1000.

Mr. Osterberg summarized the Staff Report and described the application by Washington County to construct a new street that would provide a connection of this street, which is located in both the City of Beaverton and Washington County. He noted that the application proposes an impact to an historic resource, *The John Henry House*, which is located on Henry Street. He discussed a letter from *David Evans and Associates, Inc.*, regarding minor modification of the design to request approval of a specific improvement into the GTE site; a letter from president of *Midas Auto Systems Experts* regarding their facility on SW Cedar Hills Boulevard objecting to the proposed closure of SW Lloyd to the proposed Millikan Way; and a letter from Washington County regarding the application. Observing that the application meets applicable criteria, he recommended approval, with Conditions of Approval, and offered to respond to any questions or comments.

APPLICANT:

GILLIAN ZACHARIAS, representing *David Evans and Associates, Inc.*, provided a brief overview and history of the proposed project. She described the project, which affects seventeen properties and provides for the removal of seven structures, including *The John Henry House*. Observing that there has been seasonal flooding in some areas, she mentioned that *David Evans and Associates, Inc.* has been retained to perform a sub-basin analysis. She mentioned that Washington County has conducted the necessary public involvement, including open houses, letters and NAC meetings for this City project that is being managed by the County. She discussed situation involving *The John Henry House*, observing that they have advertised for inquiries regarding removal of the house but have not received any offers. She commented that with no way to go around this structure, it might be necessary to proceed with the demolition, although it is hopeful that an interested party will step in during the interim. She discussed undergrounding of existing utilities, adding that there is no MSTP funding available for undergrounding. She discussed the letters received from from Lanphere and Midas and recommend approval of the application.

AL BARKOULI, representing *David Evans and Associates, Inc.*, discussed the parking lot, which is currently accessed through Lloyd Street.

Chairman Lemon expressed concern with approval of a project based on the hope that all issues of concern would work out somewhere down the line, emphasizing that this could create a significant problem.

ROD BLISS, representing Washington County, explained the right-of-way process, adding that while it had been suggested, GTE could not be forced to

purchase the property. Observing that he is not able to condemn private property for another private property owner, he clarified that he can only condemn property for the public good.

JOE YOUNKINS, Principal Engineer with Washington County, pointed out that GTE needs to make GTE decisions. Observing that it is necessary to provide for the continuity of traffic, he emphasized the importance of pedestrian safety for pedestrians and bicycle access. Noting that it is not the County's responsibility to provide for parking for GTE, he mentioned that he does not know that a safety issue exists.

Mr. Straus expressed his opinion that the Board is being asked to make a decision that presents an obvious potential safety hazard, expressing his opinion that it is necessary to find a way to address the fact that people will use this natural path.

Mr. Barkouli pointed out that there has been public involvement process involving GTE.

Expressing his opinion that the situation has not been completely addressed, Chairman Lemon advised the applicant that the Board would either approve or disapprove the application, at which point they would become eligible to take advantage of the appeal process.

PUBLIC TESTIMONY:

PAT RUSSELL, expressed his opinion that more architects should design the streets in downtown Beaverton, observing that County traffic engineers are designing downtown urban streets, which are supposed to be pedestrian friendly. He pointed to the illustration of Lloyd and Henry, expressing his concern with pedestrian issues should keep pedestrian in mind. He pointed out that drivers should not be diverted from their ability to drive around a block, adding that he does support the proposal.

PAUL HESSICK, representing *Falk Hardware*, expressed concern that the proposal would cut off traffic coming from Canyon turning north up to Lloyd to approach store, adding that this would prevent customers from reaching his store and have an adverse affect on business.

WILL SCHRADER, representing *Midas Auto Systems Experts*, provided a transparency on the overhead projector. Emphasizing that access to business is critical, he pointed out that current traffic patterns already make it difficult to reach his business. Observing that he does understand that it might help the overall traffic in the area, he emphasized that the proposal would have a negative affect on people attempting to reach his business.

TIM RAMIS, representing *Ramis, Crew, Corrigan & Bachrach*, on behalf of Washington County, reassured the Board that the issues regarding drainage and coordination of landscaping and retaining walls would be resolved by the County.

APPLICANT'S REBUTTAL:

Mr. Barkouli discussed issues concerning the coordination of the retaining wall and landscaping, proposed adding that because it serves no true function, the grade for the Lanphere site would be raised.

Mr. Straus expressed his concern with a potential obligation for the County to grant Lanphere an access point on Hocken.

Mr. Barkouli advised Mr. Straus that Hocken is not the responsibility of the County.

The public portion of the Public Hearing was closed.

Ms. Prentice expressed her opinion that many issues have not yet been adequately addressed, particularly with respect to right-of-ways, parking and pedestrians.

Mr. Edberg noted that it would be necessary to discuss the pedestrian crossing between the GTE parking lots, the driveway on the Lanphere property and the connection of Lloyd.

Mr. Nardoza pointed out that he is not comfortable with certain issues that have not been resolved.

Mr. Straus emphasized that very definite conditions related to the three areas mentioned could create a situation where the County could appeal to City Council or request a continuance to resolve some of these issues. He mentioned that he is prepared to make motion for approval with certain conditions, adding that the applicant would have the option of accepting additional Conditions of Approval or requesting a continuance.

Observing that the Board has only limited criterion by which to judge an application, Chairman Lemon pointed out that two items do not meet criteria. He discussed Design Criterion A and Be in regard to the relationship with existing surroundings and future allowed uses, suggesting that the application be approved, disapproved, approved with additional Conditions of Approval, or continued

Mr. Osterberg recommended that the applicant be asked whether they wish to request a continuance.

Mr. Younkens questioned the potential time frame for the continuance.

Chairman Lemon the advised Mr. Younkins that the Public Hearing could be continued to February 22, 2001.

Mr. Osterberg pointed out that necessary information must be submitted seven days prior to the Public Hearing.

Mr. Younkins requested that the Public Hearing be continued to February 22, 2001.

Mr. Osterberg advised Mr. Younkins that the applicant must sign the form for a waiver of the 120 decision date to accommodate the additional fourteen days.

Mr. Straus **MOVED** and Mr. Edberg **SECONDED** a motion that BDR 2000-0165 -- SW Millikan Way Extension Type 3 Design Review, be continued to a date certain of February 22, 2001, to address pedestrian access between the westerly GTE parking lot and the easterly portion of the GTE property and vehicle access from Lloyd Street to Millikan Way.

Motion **CARRIED**, unanimously.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES:

The minutes of January 11, 2001, as written, were submitted. Chairman Lemon asked if there were any changes or corrections. Ms. Prentice requested that paragraph 3 of page 14 be amended, as follows: "...including Conditions of Approval Nos. 1 – 18, **providing that the applicant pay for the suggested independent study**, plus an additional Condition of Approval..." Mr. Straus **MOVED** and Mr. Nardoza **SECONDED** a motion that the minutes be adopted as written and amended.

The question was called and the motion **CARRIED** unanimously.

The minutes of January 25, 2001, as written, were submitted. Chairman Lemon asked if there were any changes or corrections. Mr. Straus **MOVED** and Mr. Nardoza **SECONDED** a motion that the minutes be adopted as written and submitted.

The question was called and the motion **CARRIED** unanimously.

MISCELLANEOUS BUSINESS:

The meeting adjourned at 11:14 p.m.